



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,553	01/04/2001	David A. Cobbley	INTL-0526-US (P10830)	3695

7590 04/19/2004

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/754,553

Applicant(s)

COBBLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh T. Vu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the Request for Consideration, Filed 02/02/04.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being anticipated by Vale (U.S. Pat. No. 6,359,572) in view of Zellweger et al. ("Zellweger", U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,170).

Per claim 1, Vale teaches a method comprising: displaying a data entry area and a keyboard image on a user interface (figs. 5-7; data entry area 68; col. 5, lines 35-50), but does not teach moving a data entry area on said user interface to display said keyboard image. However, Zellweger teaches moving a data entry area on said user interface to display said keyboard image (Figs. 9-12; col. 11, lines 13-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Zellweger in the invention of Vale in order to add more data in a user interface while substantially maintaining an unobstructed view of the original data.

Art Unit: 2174

Per claim 2, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 1 including moving a data entry area on said interface to enable an unobstructed view of said keyboard image and said data entry areas (figs. 9-12; col. 11, lines 13-29).

Per claim 3, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 1 including searching for coding associated with data entry areas to identify the location of a data entry area (col. 11, line 22-col. 12, lines 32; col. 13, lines 8-19).

Per claim 4, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 3 including searching for characteristic coding of a web page (col. 13, line 8- col. 14, line 20).

Per claim 5, Zellweger the method of claim 1 including moving data from the location where a keyboard image is to be positioned and positioning said data at another location on said interface (figs. 9-12, and 23-24; col. 11, lines 13-29; col. 13, lines 8-20).

Claims 7-11 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-5 respectively.

Claims 13-17 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-5 respectively.

Per claim 18, Vale teaches the system of claim 13 further including a touch-screen coupled to the processor (col. 3, lines 10-15).

Per claim 19, Zellweger teaches the system of claim 13 wherein said storage stores instructions to determine whether the image will obscure the data entry area and, if so, to move the data entry area (col. 11, line 40- col. 12, lines 30).

Claims 6, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Vale (U.S. Pat. No. 6,359,572) in view of Zellweger et al. ("Zellweger", U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,170) and further in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,359).

Art Unit: 2174

Per claim 6, Vale and Zellweger teaches the method of claim 1, but does not teaches the method including scrolling the data entry area to prevent the data entry area from being obscured by the keyboard image. However, Kobayshi teaches the method including scrolling the data entry area to prevent the data entry area from being obscured by the keyboard image (fig. 7A-7D; col. 1, lines 40-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Kobayshi in the invention of Kanevsky and Vale in order users to scroll the screen effectively to display content that are not fully displayed within a window.

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Request for Consideration have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument is that Vale and Zellweger do not teach displaying a keyboard image on a user interface and moving a data entry area on said interface to display said keyboard image. The examiner does not agree because Vale teaches displaying a data entry area and a keyboard image on a user interface (figs. 5-7; data entry area 68; col. 5, lines 35-50; the examiner considers the data entry area as the area 68 comprising "Seattle, WA", "Tokyo", the date selection arrow, and the image of the clocks representing the data entered by the user), but does not teach moving the data entry area on said user interface to display said keyboard image. However, Zellweger teaches moving a data area on said user interface to display additional data

Art Unit: 2174

(Figs. 9-12; col. 11, lines 13-29 and further in figs. 13 and 14, image 158, col. 12, lines 33-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Zellweger in the invention of Vale in order to add more data in a user interface while substantially maintaining an unobstructed view of the original data.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (703)-308-9119. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100